



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*M.S.*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/362,504	07/27/99	RAVI	K AM1126D1/T08
------------	----------	------	----------------

PATENT COUNSEL  
3050 BOWERS AVENUE  
PO BOX 450A  
SANTA CLARA  
CA 95052

IM62/0809

EXAMINER

ZERVIGON, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1763

*10*

DATE MAILED:

08/09/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks**

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/362,504

Applicant(s)

Kramadhati et al

Examiner

Rudy Zervigon

Group Art Unit

1763

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rudy Zervigon

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Chun-Pok Leung

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Aug 2, 2000Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: 16

Identification of prior art discussed:

Jin Onuki et al

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Reference was made to the Figure 1 waveforms of the Jin Onuki et al reference which shows a cycling of power application and substrate biasing. In view of claim 16, Mr. Leung suggested claim language that I agreed would be suggestive enough to remove a 102 rejection of the claim however would require a consideration under 103.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

GREGORY MILLS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

RUDY ZERVIGON  
PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1763

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.